Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-65 and 67-86 are now pending in this application. Claims 18-30, 43-49, and 67-86 have been withdrawn from consideration. In the December 23, 2008 Office Action, Claims 31, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 17-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,237,086. Claims 1-17, 31-39, 42, and 50-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by RadiSys, "Platform Management: CP80 Platform Management Overview" (hereinafter "*RadiSys1*") and RadiSys, "Platform Management: Universal Developer's Guide" (hereinafter "*RadiSys2*"). Claims 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2* in view of Intel, "Intel® Server System SSH4 Board Set," (hereinafter "*Intel*").

By this amendment, Claims 9-10, 13-16, 18-30, 40-41, 43-49, and 58-86 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 8, 11, 17, 50, 55, and 57 have also been amended. Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-8, 11-12, 17, 31-39, 42, and 50-57 will be pending in the present application. For the reasons set forth below, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and immediate allowance of this application.

Restriction Requirement

In the Office Action, the Examiner has required restriction of claims 40 and 41. This requirement is respectfully traversed.

The applicants respectfully notes that a serious burden for the Examiner to search and examine both claims 40 and 41 does not exist as evidenced by the examination of claims 40 and 41 in the current Office Action at pages 15-16, the previous Office Action mailed June 26, 2008 at pages 15-16, and the Office Action mailed December 18, 2007 at page 10. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement as no serious burden on the Examiner exists.

Nevertheless, in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 121, the applicants hereby cancel 40-41 without prejudice. Applicants also note that claim 31 is generic, and therefore upon allowance of claim 31, from which claims 40-41 depends and therefore includes all the limitations of such generic claim, claims 40-41 will be rejoined to the application and examined.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has required withdrawn claims 18-30, 43-49, and 67-86 to be canceled.

Applicants respectfully note that MPEP 821 does not require the cancellation of non-elected claims prior to the finding that the application is allowable, except for the presence of claims directed to non-elected subject matter or claims eligible for rejoinder. However, solely in the interest to further prosecution, the applicants have canceled claims 18-30, 43-49, and 67-86. No representation is made as to the patentability of the non-elected and cancelled claims. Furthermore, the applicants reserve all rights under 35 U.S.C. 120 and 121 to pursue such claims or similar claims in one or more divisional applications.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 31, 40, and 41 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 17-18 of U.S. patent No. 7,237,086. A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-17, 31-39, 42, and 50-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2*. The applicants respectfully submit that *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of these claims.

Claim 1

Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "defining a plurality of description files, each description file corresponding to a component which may be included within a configuration for the computer system, wherein the plurality of description files each specify a component classification for the component corresponding to each description file and the type of information that may be provided by the component." Regarding this portion of amended claim 1, the Office Action at p. 11 cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "The standard software created

by the Developer's guide using the configuration commands with respect to a device in the IPMO subsystem."

While the *Radisys2* describes certain device configuration commands, such as "Set Sensor Configuration" on p. 22 and "Set Control State" on p. 23, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses "a plurality of description files," as recited in claim 1. In particular, the configuration commands disclosed in *Radisys2* are entirely unrelated to the recited "description files." Further, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses "each description file corresponding to a component which may be included within a configuration for the computer system" or "wherein the plurality of description files each specify a component classification for the component corresponding to each description file and the type of information that may be provided by the component." *Radisys1* does not cure these deficiencies of *Radisys2*. Accordingly, *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of these claims.

Amended claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the identifying act (b) comprises (b)(i) issuing an identification request on the first slave address, wherein the identification request commands the first component to respond with identification information associated with the first component, (b)(ii) receiving the identification information from the first component, and (b)(iii) analyzing the identification information against the plurality of description files to determine which of the plurality of description files corresponds to the first component. Regarding this portion of amended claim 1, the Office Action at p. 11 cites *Radisys2* and refers to the rejection of claim 6, which states the following: "All the commands such as in the table 2, provide event logging, and the event logs provide the user to analyze detecting events in the IPMI subsystem as of FIGURE 1."

As stated in the Office Action, Table 2 on p. 12 of *Radisys2* provides a list of standard IPMI commands. However, nothing in this list or in the subsequent description of the commands teaches or describes the recited features of claim 1. In particular, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses "issuing an identification request on the first slave address, wherein the identification request commands the first component to respond with identification information associated with the first component." Further, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses "receiving the identification information from the first component." Also, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses "analyzing the identification information against the plurality of description files to determine which of the plurality of description files corresponds to the first component."

Radisys1 does not cure these deficiencies of *Radisys2*. Accordingly, *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2* do not teach, suggest, or describe each and every recitation of these claims.

The MPEP 2131 makes clear that a reference must show "each and every element" of the claim in order to anticipate the claim. For at least the reasons given above, *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not disclose each and every element of claim 1. Since claims 2-8, 11-12, and 17 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, the applicants respectfully submit that *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not anticipate the applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-8, 11-12, and 17. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that these claims are in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 2

With regards to claim 2, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "See the communication diagram between System Management Software and the devices using communication of IPMB slave address, details are in the tables, for example, table 12, p. 21." Table 12 of *Radisys2* discloses three commands: "Set SEL State," Get SEL State," and "Set Forward SEL IPMB Address." *Radisys2* at p. 21 discloses that the "Set SEL State command allows devices other than the primary BMC to have controllable logs." *Radisys2* at p. 21 discloses that the "Get SEL State command is used by management software to retrieve the state of a remote SEL." *Radisys2* at p. 21 discloses that a "device uses the Set Forward SEL IPMB Address command to control the forwarding of sensor events."

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 2. The applicants further submit that claim 2 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 3

With regard to claim 3, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "see details in the tables." Initially, it is noted that *Radisys2* contains 42 tables total. An analysis of all 42 tables shows that none of the tables teach or disclose each and every element of claim 3.

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 3. The applicants further submit that claim 3 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

In the event that the Office maintains the rejection of independent claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102, the applicants respectfully request that the Office, in the interests of compact prosecution, identify on the record and with specificity sufficient to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation, which table(s) of *Radisys2* allegedly teach or disclose each and every element of claim 3.

Claim 4

Regarding claim 4, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "Refer to Watchdog Timer (p. 13, and the definition slave address on NetFn/LUN). With regards to Watchdog Timer *Radisys2* discloses a "Reset Watchdog Timer" command and "Set Watchdog Timer" command on p. 13. *Radisys2* discloses that the "Reset Watchdog Timer command is used for starting or restarting the watchdog timer from the initial countdown value set with the Set Watchdog Timer command." Further, *Radisys2* discloses that the "Set Watchdog Timer command is used for initializing and configuring the watchdog timer." Nothing in the description of the Watchdog Timer in *Radisys2* does it teach or disclose "issuing a discovery request on a possible slave address" and "after a predetermined period in time has passed from which the discovery request was issued on the slave address, repeating the issuing act until each of the plurality of possible slave addresses have been pinged," as recited in claim 4.

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 4. The applicants further submit that claim 4 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 5

Regarding claim 5, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "see p. 4, forward events are logged." *Radisys2* at p. 4 discloses a forwarding mechanism whereby "a device will forward a received sensor event to another device in the form of an Add Sel Entry command." However, nothing in the description of the forwarding mechanism of *Radisys2* does it teach or disclose "in response to receiving the acknowledgement responses from each of the specific plurality of components, adding the active slave addresses from which the acknowledgement responses are received to a log file, wherein the log file, when complete, comprises a listing of each of the plurality of active slave addresses."

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 5. The applicants further submit that claim 5 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 6

Regarding claim 6, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "All the commands such as in the table 2, provide event logging, and the event logs provide the user to analyze detecting events in the IPMI subsystem as of FIGURE 1." As stated in the Office Action, Table 2 on p. 12 of *Radisys2* provides a list of standard IPMI commands. However, nothing in this list or in the subsequent description of the commands teaches or describes the recited features of claim 6. In particular, nothing in *Radisys2* discloses "traversing the listing in the log file to extract therefrom an active slave address," "issuing an identification request to the extracted active slave address," "receiving information from one of the specific plurality of components communicatively accessible on the extracted active slave address," or "analyzing the received information to identify a type of information provided by the component communicatively accessible on the extracted active slave address."

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 6. The applicants further submit that claim 6 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants

therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 7

Regarding claim 7, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "provided by IPMI message issued as being associated with detected event sensor." However, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or discloses that a "specific active slave address" is extracted from the IPMI message.

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 7. The applicants further submit that claim 7 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 8

Regarding claim 8, the Office Action cites *Radisys2*, stating the following: "Claim functionality is the same to Claim 6, i.e., the user is manually using the system of Figure 1 (Radisys2) to repeat for each slave address of step (b) in claim 6 (Not a manual acts would read on the guidance of the developer's Guide)." It is noted that claim 1, from which claim 8 depends, recites a "computer-implemented method" and do not comprise manual acts. Further, nothing in *Radisys2* teaches or disclose "wherein the configuration file is created by the creating act to specify the type of information identified for each of the specific plurality of components such that when the configuration file is incorporated into the management module, the management module is consequently operable to receive the identified types of information from each of the specific plurality of components."

For at least the reasons given above, none of the descriptions of these commands teach or disclose the recited features of claim 8. The applicants further submit that claim 8 is also patentable because it depends from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that this claim is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 31

With regards to claim 31, the Office Action on p. 14 states the following "See rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 1-17." Accordingly, the above-described deficiencies of the previous rejections with respect to claims 1-17 apply, at least in part, to claim 31. Further, claim 31 recites additional features that are not recited in claims 1-17. For example, claim 31 recites "load the configuration file into the management module to provide the management module with an ability to receive operational information from the detected and identified components and analyze, based on the received operational information, whether an event has occurred in the computer system, wherein the operational information relates to operations associated with the computer system." In this respect, the previous rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 1-17 is necessarily deficient.

The MPEP 2131 makes clear that a reference must show "each and every element" of the claim in order to anticipate the claim. For at least the reasons given above, *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not disclose each and every element of claim 31. Since claims 32-39 and 42 depend from claim 31 and recite further claim features, the applicants respectfully submit that *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not anticipate the applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 32-39 and 42. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that these claims are in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim 50

With regards to claim 50, the Office Action on p. 14 states the following "See rationale addressed in the rejection of claims 1-17." Accordingly, the above-described deficiencies of the previous rejections with respect to claims 1-17 apply, at least in part, to claim 31.

The MPEP 2131 makes clear that a reference must show "each and every element" of the claim in order to anticipate the claim. For at least the reasons given above, *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not disclose each and every element of claim 31. Since claims 51-57 depend from claim 50 and recite further claim features, the applicants respectfully submit that *Radisys1* and *Radisys2* do not anticipate the applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 51-57. Accordingly, the applicants therefore submit that these claims are in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *RadiSys1* and *RadiSys2* in view of Intel. The rejection of claims 40-41 are now moot in light of their cancelation.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application and allowance of the claims at an early date is solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

/Steven Koon Hon Wong/

Date: March 23, 2009

"Steven" Koon Hon Wong
Reg. No. 48,459

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, N.W.
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900